

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

FILED
08 JUL 31 PM 3:26 *mb*
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
This space for
Clerk's Office File Stamp
DEPU

TO: ☒ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☒ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Lantz Arnell Brooks
FROM: E. Lloyd Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 7/25/08
CASE NO.: 08cv441-LAB (RBB) DOCUMENT FILED BY: Lantz Arnell
CASE TITLE: Arnell v. Jack Lieb Esq. And Ass. Et al
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Notice of Motion for Reconsideration of Denial of Request

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/>	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/>	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/>	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/>	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
<input type="checkbox"/>		Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<u>OTHER: missing signature on Notice of Motion</u>

Date forwarded: 7/25/08

ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

☐ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
☒ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties. *mb*

Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ☐ Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers ☐

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

Dated: 7/31/2008
cc: All Parties

CHAMBERS OF: RRB
By: Paul R. R. R.

REJECTED

Lantz Arnell
1516 Glorietta Blvd.
Coronado, CA 92118
(619) 435-4064

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

LANTZ E. ARNELL
Plaintiff

Case No. 08-cv-00441(LAB)

NOTICE of Motion for
Reconsideration of Denial of
Plaintiff's request for Court Order
For Surveillance Video

v.

Oral Argument Requested

JACK LIEB, ESQ. , AND ASSOC.,
JUDGE W. MCADAM, ET AL.
Defendants

To CHERYL BRIERTON, attorney for the Honorable Judge William
McAdam.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to FRCP Rule 60b., plaintiff will
move this court to reconsider the recent denial of a court order for bank
surveillance video because of a manifest showing of a failure to consider the